

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action dated June 16, 2004, claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. (US 4,985,930).

Claims 2, 4, 15, 17, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of Kunitake et al. (US 5446,803).

Claims 9, 18, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of Hashiya et al. (US 6,333,997).

Claims 5-8 and 10 stand objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 9 stands objected because of minor informalities.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 21 to further define the invention, has amended claim 9 in accordance with the Examiner's comments, and has added new claim 23. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are presently pending.

Objection of Claim 9 under 37 CFR § 1.75(a)

Claim 9 stands objected under 37 CFR § 1.75(a) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention or discovery. Applicant has amended claim 9 to correct the minor informalities in accordance with the Examiner's comment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.75(a), respectfully requests that the rejection

under 37 CFR § 1.75(a) be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. (US 4,985,930), claims 2, 4, 15, 17, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of Kunitake et al. (US 5,446,803), and claims 9, 18, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of Hashiya et al. (US 6,333,997). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of all claims, and respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites “a document image processing device, comprising: a predetermined pixel block extraction part that extracts a predetermined pixel block that appears commonly on at least some pages from an input document image; and an image correction part that corrects a location of the whole input document image so that a position of the predetermined pixel block extracted by the predetermined pixel block extraction part is based on a reference position or a position of a reference pixel block in the document image.”

Similarly, independent claim 15, as amended recites a document image processing method, including in part, “extracting a predetermined pixel block commonly appearing at least in some pages from an input document image,” and amended independent claims 15 and 16, and original independent claim 17 all recite a document image processing method, including in part, “correcting a location of the whole input document image so that a position of the extracted predetermined pixel block is based on the reference position.” Moreover, independent claim 19, as amended recites a memory medium readable by a computer, including in part, “extracting a

predetermined pixel block commonly appearing at least in some pages from an input document image,” and amended independent claims 19, 20, and 21 all recite a memory medium readable by a computer, including in part “correcting a location of the whole input document image so that a position of the extracted predetermined pixel block is based on the reference position or the position of the reference pixel block.” Applicant respectfully submits that at least these features recited by amended independent claims 1, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 21 and original independent claim 17 are neither taught or suggested by Takeda et al.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Takeda et al. discloses a predetermined pixel block extraction part that extracts a predetermined pixel block that appears commonly on at least some pages from an input document image. Furthermore, Takeda et al. allegedly discloses an image correction part that corrects a location of the whole input document image so that a position of the predetermined pixel block extracted by the predetermined pixel block extraction part is coincident with a reference position of a reference pixel block in the document image.

As depicted in FIG. 2, Takeda et al. discloses a rectangular frame 38 (i.e. predetermined pixel block) which contains the information 37, keyword for image retrieval 39, and new/additional information provided by user 40. Furthermore, Takeda et al. discloses a method of correcting the skew image by applying the Hough transformation (col. 5, line 31 to col. 6 line 42).

Applicant respectfully submits that a predetermined pixel block extraction part described in the present application performs a page by page analysis on the input document image to first extract the prospective multiple predetermined pixel blocks formed of either image (i.e. diagram, symbol) or character/number in each page, then further analyzes these extracted pixel blocks to

determine the commonly appearing single or plurality of pixel blocks and assign them as the predetermining pixel block/blocks. In contrast to Takeda et al., the present invention teaches single or plurality of predetermined pixel blocks appearing in at least some pages of the input documents. However, Takeda et al. is completely silent about the predetermined pixel block 38 appearing in at least some pages of the inputted information.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that step 113 in FIG. 4 of Takeda et al. is a skew correction method that teaches a normalizing process implementing Hough transformation in order to correct the skew which does not require user provided reference point. In contrast to Takeda et al., an image correction part of the present invention performs an appropriate linear rearrangement of the whole image with respect to the user defined reference position and the predetermined pixel box within each page. By performing the image correction, the whole information (i.e. image/diagram/symbol and characters/page number) in one page is adapted to move horizontally, vertically, or diagonally, depending on the reference point provided on the instant page. If there were a skew on the input image document, the skew correction would be performed prior to implementing the image correction part of the present invention.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, ‘[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.’ Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that since Takeda et al. fails to teach or suggest every element of at least amended independent claims 1, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 21, and original independent claim 17, then Takeda et al. fails to anticipate at least amended independent claims

1, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 21, and original independent claim 17, hence dependent claims 2-14, 18, and 22.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by Takeda et al. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 5-8 and 10 are in condition for allowance with regard to amended independent claim 1 from which they respectfully depend. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that objections of dependent claims 5-8 and 10 be withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-4, 9, 11-14, 18, and 22 are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with regard to amended independent claims 1, 15, and 19 upon which they depend, as well as the individual features of dependent claims 2-4, 9, 11-14, 18, and 22 recite.

New Claim 23

Applicant has added new claim 23. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 23 further defines the subject matter of the present invention. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of newly added claim 23.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Registration No. 33,652

Dated: September 14, 2004

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001